Initialization-free Distributed Algorithms for Optimal Resource Allocation with Feasibility Constraints and its Application to Economic Dispatch of Power Systems☆

Peng Yi, Yiguang Hong[a], Feng Liu[b]

[a]*Key Lab of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences,*
[b]*Department of Electrical Engineering, Tsinghua University*

arXiv:1510.08579v1 [math.OC] 29 Oct 2015

Abstract

In this paper, a class of distributed algorithms are proposed for resource allocation optimization problem. The allocation decisions are made to minimize the sum of all the agents' local objective functions while satisfying both the global network resource constraint and the local allocation feasibility constraints. Here, the data corresponding to each agent in the considered separable optimization problem, such as the network resources, the local allocation feasibility constraint, and the local objective function, is only accessible to individual agent and cannot be shared with others, rendering a novel distributed optimization problem. In this regard, we propose a category of projection-based continuous-time algorithms to solve this distributed optimization problem in an initialization-free and scalable manner. Thus, no re-initialization is required even if operation environment or network configuration is changed, making it possible to achieve a "plug-and-play" optimal operation of networked heterogeneous agents. The algorithm convergence is established for strictly convex objective functions, and the exponential convergence is proved for strongly convex functions. The proposed algorithm is applied to the distributed economic dispatch problem in a power grid, illustrating that it can adaptively achieve global optimum in a scalable way, even if the generation cost, system load, or network configuration is varying. The application primarily demonstrates the promising implications of the proposed algorithm.

Keywords: Resource allocation, Distributed optimization, Multi-agent system, Plug-and-play algorithm, Gradient flow, Projected dynamical system, Economic dispatch

1. Introduction

Resource allocation is one of the most important problems in network optimization, which has been widely investigated in various areas such as economics systems, communication networks, sensor networks, and power grids. The allocation decisions can be made centrally by gathering all the network data together to a decision-making center, and then sent back to corresponding agents (referring to Ibaraki & Katoh (1988)). Differing from this, the master-slave-type decentralized algorithms, either price-based (Arrow & Hurwicz (1960)) or resource-based (Heal (1969)), achieve the optimal allocations by the local computations in the slave agents under the coordinations of the master/center through a one-to-all communication architecture. However, these methods may not be suitable or effective for the resource allocation in large-scale networks with numerous heterogeneous agents due to complicated network structures, heavy communication burden, privacy concerns, unbearable time delays, and unexpected single-point failures. In this regard, fully distributed resource allocation optimization algorithms are highly desirable.

Distributed optimization, which cooperatively achieves optimal decisions by the local manipulation with private data and the diffusion of local information through a multi-agent network, has drawn more and more research attention in recent years. To circumvent the requirement of control center or master, various distributed optimization models or algorithms have been developed for different problems (Nedic, Ozdaglar, & Parrilo (2010), Sayed (2014), Lou, Shi, Johansson, & Hong (2014), and Yi & Hong (2014)). In light of the increasing attention to distributed optimization and the seminal work on distributed resource allocation in Ho, Servi, & Suri (1980), some distributed algorithms for resource allocation optimization have been proposed in Xiao & Boyd (2006), Lakshmanan & Farias (2008), Necoara, Nesterov, & Glineur (2011), Ghadimi, Shames, & Johansson (2013), and Beck, Nedic, Ozdaglar, & Teboulle (2014).

Continuous-time gradient flow algorithms have been widely investigated for convex optimization after the pioneer work Arrow, Huwicz, & Uzawa (1958), and detailed references can be found in Liao, Qi, & Qi (2004) and Bhaya & Kaszkurewicz (2006). Gradient flow algorithms have been applied to networks control and optimization (Low, Paganini, & Doyle (2002), Feijer & Paganini (2010) and Ferragut & Paganini (2014)), neural networks (Liao, Qi, & Qi (2004)), and stochastic approximation (Dupuis & Kushner (1987)). Recently, continuous-time gradient flow algorithms have been adopted for solving distributed optimization problems, including Wang & Elia (2011),

☆This work is supported partially by NNSF of China under Grants. 61174071 and 61333001, and partially by 973 Program under Grant 2014CB845301.

Email addresses: yipeng@amss.ac.cn,yghong@iss.ac.cn (Peng Yi, Yiguang Hong), lfeng@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn (Feng Liu)

Gharesifard & Cortés (2014), Droge, Kawashima & Egerstedt (2014), Kia, Cortés, & Martinez (2015) and Yi, Hong & Liu (2015), and particularly for the distributed economic dispatch problem (DEDP) in power grids (Zhao, Topcu, Li, & Low (2014), Cherukuri, & Cortés (2015) and Cherukuri & Cortés (2014)), which is to find the optimal secure generation allocations for balancing the load in a distributed manner.

Distributed constrained optimization problems are more complicated than those without constraints. It is shown that projected continuous-time dynamics can be employed to solve constrained optimization problems in Venets (1985), Nagurney & Zhang (1995), Xia & Wang (2000), and Gao (2003). Most recently, the projected dynamics ideas have been applied to distributed constrained optimization with remarkable results in Liu, Qiu, & Xie (2014), Wang & Liu (2015), and Yi, Hong & Liu (2015).

As a specific type of distributed constrained optimization problems, distributed resource allocation optimization (DRAO) problems are motivated by various practical problems, particularly by the DEDP in power grids (Zhang, Liu, Wang, Liu, & Ferrese (2015)). In this challenging problem, each agent is only accessible to its private data, such as the local objective function, local allocation feasibility constraint (AFC), and local resource data, which cannot be shared or known by other agents. As the entire network resource is the sum of individual agent's local resource, the agents need to cooperatively decide the optimal resource allocation in a distributed way, so that the global objective function (as the sum of all local objective functions) is minimized while all constraints (including the network resource constraint and the local AFCs) are satisfied.

It is worth noting that, even though not considered in most existing DRAO works, AFC is critical for the (secure) operation of practical networks, taking the channel capacity of communication system in Johari & Tsitsiklis (2004) and D'Amico, Sanguinetti & Palomar (2014) as an example). Particularly for the DEDP in power grids, the generation of each generator must be limited within its capacity bounds. The consideration of AFCs creates remarkable challenges to existing distributed methods and algorithms designed for the DRAO problems without AFCs, because the KKT (optimality) conditions for DRAO with and without AFCs are totally different (referring to Remark 3.3). Therefore, it is desired to address how to deal with AFCs involved in DARO problems. Another crucial albeit difficult problem is the initialization coordination among all agents. In most of existing works (except Cherukuri & Cortés (2014)), initialization coordination procedures are required to guarantee that the initial allocations satisfy the network resource constraint. This might only work well for static networks. For a dynamical network, however, the resources have to be re-allocated so long as the network configuration changes. This implies that the initialization coordination will inevitably be re-performed whenever the optimization algorithm re-starts, which considerably degrades the applicability of the existing algorithms. Taking the DEDP as an example, the initialization procedure is required to be coordinated among all agents whenever local load demand/generation capacity/cost changes, or any distributed generator plugs in or leaves off. This is really undesirable for achieving highly-flexible power grids with integration of ever-increasing renewables.

In the aforementioned regards, this paper aims to propose an initialization-free methodology for solving the DARO problems with AFCs. Specifically, the main technical contributions of this paper are highlighted as follows.:

- By employing the (differentiated) projection operation, a class of fully distributed continuous-time algorithm is proposed. As a kind of projected dynamics, the algorithm keeps each local allocation of individual agent within its own AFC set. Meanwhile, the algorithm ensures the network resource constraint asymptotically without requiring it is satisfied at the initial point. Therefore, it is initialization-free and different from those given in Xiao & Boyd (2006), Lakshmanan & Farias (2008), Necoara, Nesterov, & Glineur (2011), Ghadimi, Shames, & Johansson (2013), and provides another type of initialization-free algorithm besides the one in Cherukuri & Cortés (2014).

- When the objective functions are strictly convex, the convergence of the projected algorithm is shown by resorting to the properties of Laplacian matrix and projection operation and LaSalle invariance principle. Furthermore, when the objective functions are strongly convex, an exponentially convergent algorithm is derived by adopting differentiated projection operator. The results can be regarded as an extension of some existing distributed optimization algorithms (Wang & Elia (2011), Kia, Cortés, & Martinez (2015), Liu, Qiu, & Xie (2014), and Wang & Liu (2015)) and an application of projected dynamics for variational inequalities (Gao (2003) and Xia & Wang (2000)) to DRAO problem.

- The proposed algorithm is directly applied to the DEDP in power systems considering generation capacity limitations. It enables the plug-and-play operation for power grids with high-penetration of flexible renewables. Our algorithm is also essentially different from the ones in Cherukuri, & Cortés (2015) and Cherukuri & Cortés (2014). Simulation results demonstrate that the algorithm effectively deals with various data changes, and also illustrate the algorithm scalability.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. The preliminaries are given and then the DRAO problem with AFCs is formulated with the basic assumptions in Section 2. Then a distributed algorithm in the form of projected dynamics is proposed with the convergence analysis in Section 3. For strongly convex objective functions, a differentiated projected algorithm is proposed with exponential convergence analysis in Section 4. Moreover, the application to the DEDP in power systems is shown in section 5 with numerical experiments. Finally, the concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

Notations: Denote $\mathbf{1}_m = (1, ..., 1)^T \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{0}_m = (0, ..., 0)^T \in \mathbf{R}^m$. Denote $(x_1, ..., x_n)$ as the column vector stacked with vectors $x_1, ..., x_n$. I_n denotes the identity matrix

in $\mathbf{R}^{n\times n}$. For a matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$, a_{ij} or A_{ij} stands for the matrix entry in the ith row and jth column of A. $A \otimes B$ denotes the Kronecker product of matrixes A and B. Denote $\times_{i=1,...,n}\Omega_i$ as the Cartesian product of the sets $\Omega_i, i = 1, ..., n$. Denote the set of interiors of set K as $int(K)$, and the boundaries of set K as ∂K.

2. Preliminaries and Problem Formulation

In this section, we first give some preliminary knowledge related to convex analysis and graph theory, and then formulate the DRAO problem of interest.

2.1. Convex analysis and projection

The following concepts and properties about convex function, convex set, and projection operations come from Ruszczynski (2006) and Bertsekas (2009). A differentiable convex function $f : \mathbf{R}^m \to \mathbf{R}$ has locally Lipschitz continuous gradient if given any compact set Q, there exists constant k^Q such that $\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \le k^Q\|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in Q$. A differentiable function $f(x)$ is called μ-strongly convex on $\mathbf{R}^m$ if there exists a constant $\mu > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $f(y) \ge f(x) + \nabla^T f(x)(y - x) + \frac{1}{2}\mu\|y - x\|^2$, or equivalently,

$$(x - y)^T(\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)) \ge \mu\|x - y\|^2. \tag{1}$$

The following notations describe the geometry properties of the convex set. Denote $C_\Omega(x)$ as the normal cone of Ω at x: $C_\Omega(x) = \{v : \langle v, y-x\rangle \le 0, \quad \forall y \in \Omega\}$. Denote $c_\Omega(x)$ as: $c_\Omega(x) = \{v : \|v\| = 1, \langle v, y-x\rangle \le 0, \ \forall y \in \Omega\}$. The feasible direction cone of Ω at x is given as : $K_\Omega(x) = \{d : d = \beta(y - x), \ y \in \Omega, \ \beta \ge 0\}$. The tangent cone of set Ω at x is defined as: $T_\Omega(x) = \{v : v = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{x^k - x}{\tau_k}, \tau_k \ge 0, \tau_k \to 0, x^k \in \Omega, x^k \to x\}$. Then $T_\Omega(x)$ is the closure of $K_\Omega(x)$ when Ω is a closed convex set, and is the polar cone to $C_\Omega(x)$: $T_\Omega(x) = \{y : \langle y, x\rangle \le 0, \forall x \in C_\Omega(x)\}$ (referring to Lemma 3.13 of Ruszczynski (2006)).

Define the projection of x onto a closed convex set Ω by $P_\Omega(x) = \arg\min_{y\in\Omega} \|x - y\|$. The basic property of projection operation is

$$\langle x - P_\Omega(x), P_\Omega(x) - y\rangle \ge 0, \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^m, \forall y \in \Omega. \tag{2}$$

The following relationships can be derived from (2)

$$\|x - P_\Omega(x)\|_2^2 + \|P_\Omega(x) - y\|_2^2 \le \|x - y\|_2^2, \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^m, \forall y \in \Omega, \tag{3}$$

and

$$\|P_\Omega(x) - P_\Omega(y)\| \le \|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in \mathbf{R}^m. \tag{4}$$

With projection operation, the normal cone $C_\Omega(x)$ can also be defined as (Lemma 2.38 of Ruszczynski (2006))

$$C_\Omega(x) = \{v : P_\Omega(x + v) = x\}. \tag{5}$$

For closed convex set Ω, point $x \in \Omega$ and direction v, define differentiated projection operator as (Dupuis & Kushner (1987) and Nagurney & Zhang (1995))

$$\Pi_\Omega(x, v) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{P_\Omega(x + \delta v) - x}{\delta}. \tag{6}$$

The basic properties of differentiated projection operator are given as follows (Brogliato, Daniilidis, Lemarchal, & Acary (2006))

Lemma 2.1. *(i):If $x \in int(\Omega)$, then $\Pi_\Omega(x, v) = v$; (ii): $x \in \partial\Omega$, and $\max_{n\in c_\Omega(x)}\langle v, n\rangle \le 0$, then $\Pi_\Omega(x, v) = v$; (iii): $x \in \partial\Omega$, and $\max_{n\in c_\Omega(x)}\langle v, n\rangle \ge 0$, then $\Pi_\Omega(x, v) = v - \langle v, n^*\rangle n^*$, where $n^* = \arg\max_{n\in c_\Omega(x)}\langle v, n\rangle$. Therefore, the operator $\Pi_\Omega(x, v)$ in* (6) *is equivalent with the projection of v onto $T_\Omega(x)$:*

$$\Pi_\Omega(x, v) = P_{T_\Omega(x)}(v).$$

2.2. Graph theory

The following concepts of graph theory can be found in Mesbahi & Egerstedt (2010). The information sharing or exchanging among the agents is described by graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$. The edge set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ contains all the information interactions. If agent i can get information from agent j, then $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and agent j belongs to agent i's neighbor set $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j|(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be undirected when $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$. A path of graph $\mathcal{G}$ is a sequence of distinct agents in $\mathcal{N}$ such that any consecutive agents in the sequence corresponding to an edge of graph $\mathcal{G}$. Agent j is said to be connected to agent i if there is a path from j to i. $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be connected if any two agents are connected.

Define adjacency matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ of $\mathcal{G}$ with $a_{ij} = 1$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Define the degree matrix $Deg = diag\{\sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}, ..., \sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}\}$. Then the Laplacian of graph $\mathcal{G}$ is $L = Deg - A$. When graph $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected undirected graph, 0 is a simple eigenvalue of Laplacian L with the eigenspace $\{\alpha\mathbf{1}_n|\alpha \in \mathbf{R}\}$, and $L\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{0}_n$, $\mathbf{1}_n^T L = \mathbf{0}_n^T$, while all other eigenvalues are positive. Denote the eigenvalues of L in an ascending order as $0 < s_2 \le \cdots \le s_n$, then by Courant-Fischer Theorem,

$$\min_{\substack{x\neq 0,\\ \mathbf{1}^T x=0}} x^T Lx = s_2\|x\|_2^2, \quad \max_{x\neq 0} x^T Lx = s_n\|x\|_2^2. \tag{7}$$

2.3. Problem formulation

Consider a group of agents with the index set $\mathcal{N} = \{1, ..., n\}$ to make an optimal allocation of network resource under both the network resource constraint and AFCs. Agent i can decide its local allocation $x_i \in \mathbf{R}^m$, and can access the local resource data $d_i \in \mathbf{R}^m$. The total network resource is $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i$, and therefore, the allocation should satisfy the **network resource constraint:** $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} x_i = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i$**.** Furthermore, the allocation of agent i should satisfy the local **allocation feasibility constraint (AFC):** $x_i \in \Omega_i$**,** where $\Omega_i \subset \mathbf{R}^m$ is a closed convex set only known by agent i. Agent i also has a local objective function $f_i(x_i) : \mathbf{R}^m \to \mathbf{R}$ associated with its local allocation x_i. Denote $X = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ as the allocation vector of the whole network. Then the task for the agents is to collectively find the optimal allocation corresponding to the DRAO problem as follows

Distributed Resource Allocation Optimization :

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{x_i\in\mathbf{R}^m,\ i\in\mathcal{N}} f(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} f_i(x_i) \\ &subject\ to \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} x_i = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i, \\ &\qquad x_i \in \Omega_i,\ i \in \mathcal{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Clearly, the problem (8) is an extension of the previous optimization models in Xiao & Boyd (2006), Lakshmanan & Farias (2008) and Necoara, Nesterov, & Glineur (2011) by introducing the additional AFCs, that is $x_i \in \Omega_i$. And $x_i \in \Omega_i$ is also a generalization of previous box constraints in Johari & Tsitsiklis (2004), D'Amico, Sanguinetti & Palomar (2014) and Cherukuri & Cortés (2014), therefore, extends the modeling flexibility. The equality network resource constraint requires the resource to be exactly allocated to each agent. However, (8) can accommodate the inequality network resource constraint by introducing nonnegative auxiliary variables. In fact, the DEDP can be exactly modeled as (8).

The following assumptions are given for (8), which were also adopted for distributed optimization or resource allocation in Feijer & Paganini (2010), Kia, Cortés, & Martinez (2015) and Wang & Liu (2015).

Assumption 1. *The functions $f_i(x_i), i \in \mathcal{N}$ are continuously differentiable convex functions with locally Lipschitz continuous gradients and positive definite Hessians over $\mathbf{R}^m$.*

Assumption 1 implies that $f_i(x_i)$'s are strictly convex, hence guarantees the uniqueness of the optimal solution to (8).

Assumption 2. *There exists a finite optimal solution X^* to problem* (8)*. The Slater's constraint condition is satisfied for DRAO (8), namely, there exists $\tilde{x}_i \in int(\Omega_i), \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, such that $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \tilde{x}_i = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i$.*

Remark 2.2. *Define the recession cone of a convex set Ω as: $R_\Omega = \{d : x + \alpha d \in \Omega,\ \forall\ \alpha \geq 0,\ \forall x \in \Omega\}$. Then, the sufficient and necessary condition for the existence of finite optimal solution to* (8) *is (referring to Proposition 3.2.2 of Bertsekas (2009)):*

$$\times_{i\in\mathcal{N}} R_{\Omega_i} \cap \{Null(\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)\} \cap \times_{i\in\mathcal{N}} R_{f_i} = \emptyset,$$

where R_{Ω_i} is the recession cone of Ω_i and R_{f_i} is the recession cone of any nonempty level set of $f_i(x_i)$: $\{x_i \in \mathbf{R}^m | f_i(x_i) \leq \gamma\}$.

In many practical cases, we have $R_{f_i} = \emptyset$ (taking quadratic function as an example). Furthermore, $R_{\Omega_i} = \emptyset$ when Ω_i is compact. Therefore, the existence of finite solution can be easily guaranteed and verified in many practical problems.

The local objective function $f_i(x_i)$, resource data d_i and AFC set Ω_i are the **private data** for agent i, thus cannot be shared with other agents. This makes (8) a distributed optimization problem. To fulfill the cooperation between agents for solving (8), the agents can share information locally through a network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$. Next follows the assumption about the connectivity of $\mathcal{G}$ to guarantee that any agent's information can reach any other agents, which is also quite standard for distributed optimization (Liu, Qiu, & Xie (2014) and Wang & Liu (2015)).

Assumption 3. *The information sharing graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ is undirected and connected.*

In a sum, the task of this paper is to design the fully distributed algorithms for the agents to cooperatively find the optimal resource allocation to (8) without any center. In other words, agent i needs to find its optimal allocation x_i^* by manipulating its local private data d_i, Ω_i, and $f_i(x_i)$ and by cooperation with its neighbor agents through $\mathcal{G}$. To solve the problem in two different cases, a distributed projected algorithm is developed for DRAO with strictly convex objective functions in section 3, and another projected algorithm is proposed for DRAO with strongly convex objective functions based on differentiated projection operator in section 4.

3. DRAO with Strictly Convex Objective Function

In this section, an algorithm for DRAO based on projected dynamics is proposed and analyzed to solve problem (8) in a distributed manner.

The distributed algorithm for agent i is given as follows

Projected algorithm for agent i :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= P_{\Omega_i}(x_i - \nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i) - x_i \\ \dot{\lambda}_i &= -\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(z_i - z_j) + (d_i - x_i) \\ \dot{z}_i &= \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that the algorithm (9) is fully distributed because agent i only needs the local data, including d_i, $f_i(x_i)$, and Ω_i, and the shared information $\{\lambda_j, z_j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$ from its neighbor agents. Thereby, (9) does not need any center to handle all the data or coordinate all the agents. With the distributed algorithm (9), each agent has the autonomy and authority to formulate its own objective function and feasibility set, and hence, the privacy is kept within each agent. Because each agent can instantaneously react to its local data changes, it can quickly adapt its local decision. Due to the above properties, the algorithm can still be easily applied to large-scale networks.

The algorithm (9) can be easily understood based on the following observations. The duality of (8) with multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is

$$\max_{\lambda\in\mathbf{R}^m} q(\lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} q_i(\lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} \inf_{x_i\in\Omega_i} \{f_i(x_i) - \lambda^T x_i + \lambda^T d_i\}. \tag{10}$$

Although some existing distributed algorithms in Nedic, Ozdaglar, & Parrilo (2010) and Sayed (2014) addressed the dual problem (10), they need to solve a subproblem at each time (iteration) to calculate the gradients. In other words, two "time scales" are needed if applying existing distributed algorithms to (8). Here we aim to develop a simple algorithm without solving any subproblem. To this end, we formulate another constrained optimization problem with Laplacian matrix L and $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ as

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max_{\Lambda=(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_n)} & Q(\Lambda) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} q_i(\lambda_i) \\ subject\ to & (L \otimes I_m)\Lambda = \mathbf{0}_{mn}. \end{array} \tag{11}$$

The augmented Lagrangian duality of (11) with multipliers $Z = (z_1, ..., z_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{mn}$ is

$$\min_{Z} \max_{\Lambda} Q(\Lambda, Z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} q_i(\lambda_i) - Z^T (L \otimes I_m)\Lambda - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda^T (L \otimes I_m)\Lambda. \tag{12}$$

Then the projected dynamics (9) is derived by applying the gradient flow to (10) and (12) along with projection operation to guarantee the feasibility.

From the viewpoint of KKT condition, we can show that the equilibrium point of (9) yields the optimal solution to problem (8). Denote $X = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ and $\Omega = \times_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Omega_i$. Write algorithm (9) in a compact form as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X} &= P_{\Omega}(X - \nabla f(X) + \Lambda) - X, \\ \dot{\Lambda} &= -(L \otimes I_m)\Lambda - (L \otimes I_m)Z + (D - X), \\ \dot{Z} &= (L \otimes I_m)\Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions 1-3 with strictly convex objective functions, if the initial point $x_i(0) \in \Omega_i,\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, then $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i,\ \forall t \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, and (X^*, Λ^*, Z^*) is the equilibrium point of the distributed algorithm* (9) *with X^* as the optimal solution to* (8)*.*

Proof: Note that $\dot{x}_i \in T_{\Omega_i}(x_i),\ \forall x_i \in \Omega_i$, because $P_{\Omega_i}(x_i - \nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i) \in \Omega_i$. Given the initial point $x_i(0) \in \Omega_i$, by Nagumo's theorem (referring to page 174 and page 214 of Aubin & Cellina (1984)), $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i, \forall t \geq 0$. (Detailed proofs can also be found in Liao, Qi, & Qi (2004).)

To obtain the equilibrium point, we set $\dot{Z} = \mathbf{0}_{mn}$, and get $\Lambda^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^*,\ \lambda^* \in \mathbf{R}^m$, because the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected. $\dot{\Lambda} = \mathbf{0}_{mn}$ implies that $(L \otimes I_m)Z^* = D - X^*$. Because the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected, $\mathbf{1}_n^T L = \mathbf{0}_n^T$ and $(\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)(L \otimes I_m)Z = (\mathbf{1}_n^T L) \otimes I_m Z = (\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)(D - X) = \mathbf{0}_m$. Hence, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} d_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} x_i^*$. At the equilibrium point we have

$$\Lambda^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^*,\ \lambda^* \in \mathbf{R}^m, (L \otimes I_m)Z^* = D - X^*,\ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} d_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} x_i^*.$$

Meanwhile, at the equilibrium point $\dot{x}_i = 0$ implies that $P_{\Omega_i}(x_i^* - \nabla f_i(x_i^*) + \lambda^*) = x_i^*$. It follows from Lemma 2.38 of Ruszczynski (2006) that

$$-\nabla f_i(x_i^*) + \lambda^* \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i^*), i = 1, ..., n.$$

Then the equilibrium point (X^*, Λ^*, Z^*) of the algorithm (9) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{0}_{mn} \in \nabla f(X^*) - \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^* + C_{\Omega}(X^*), \\ &(\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)X^* = (\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)D, \quad X^* \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

which is exactly the optimality condition (KKT) for DRAO (8) by Theorem 3.34 in Ruszczynski (2006). Thus, the conclusion follows. □

Remark 3.2. *It can be shown that the equilibrium point of algorithm* (9) *has λ^* as the dual optimal solution to problem* (10)*, and Z^* as the dual optimal solution to problem* (11)*, following a similar analysis routine of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 5.3.2 in Bertsekas (2009). We do not discuss those here for space limitations.*

Remark 3.3. *The differences between our work and some existing ones are listed as follows*

- *The KKT condition for DRAO without AFC is*

$$\nabla f(X^*) = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^*,\ (\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)X^* = (\mathbf{1}_n^T \otimes I_m)D. \tag{15}$$

  The KKT condition (14) *for DRAO with AFC and the condition* (15) *for DRAO without AFC are totally different.* (15) *requires the optimal allocations to be the points satisfying the network resource constraint with the same marginal costs (gradients), while* (14) *requires the optimal allocations to be feasible in both network resource constraint and AFCs. The optimal allocations in* (14) *should also satisfy a variational inequality related to both the objective functions' gradients and the normal cones of the AFC sets. In fact, the marginal costs (gradients) at the optimal allocations of* (14) *do not necessarily reach the same level, and the differences can be seen as the "price of allocation feasibility".*

- *The previous algorithms (except the one in Cherukuri & Cortés (2014)) kept the network resource constraint satisfied (ensured its eventual feasibility) by setting feasible initial points through the initialization coordination procedure. In other words, the network resource constraint can be guaranteed only if it is satisfied at the initial moment. However, the initialization for network resource constraint is quite restrictive for large-scale dynamical networks because it involves global coordination and has to be performed every time the network data/configuration changes. Moreover, it is not trivial to achieve the initialization coordination with both AFCs and network resource constraint.*

- *In fact, PI-type consensus dynamics (Wang & Elia (2011) and Gharesifard & Cortés (2014)) and projected gradient flows (Liu, Qiu, & Xie (2014) and Wang & Liu (2015)), which both have been utilized for distributed optimization, are combined together to obtain the algorithm* (9) *for the KKT condition* (14)*. Local λ_i acts as the local shadow price, and all the local shadow prices must reach consensus to be the global market clearing price. Therefore, a second-order proportional-integral consensus dynamics is incorporated into (9) with the integral variable z_i summing up the disagreements between λ_i and $\{\lambda_j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$. Meanwhile, the dynamics of x_i adjusts the local allocation by comparing local shadow price and local gradient, and utilizes the projection operation to make the local allocation flowing within its AFC set all the time.*

Therefore, the algorithms given in Ho, Servi, & Suri (1980), Lakshmanan & Farias (2008), Necoara, Nesterov, & Glineur (2011) and Ghadimi, Shames, & Johansson (2013) failed to solve (8) because they cannot ensure the AFCs given in (14). Note that the algorithm (9) can ensure AFCs even during the algorithm flow with projection operation. It only requires that each agent has its initial allocation belonging to its local AFC set, which can be trivially accomplished by each agent with one

step local projection operation. Furthermore, algorithm (9) ensures the network resource constraint asymptotically without caring about whether it is satisfied at the initial points, therefore, is free of initialization coordination procedure. Due to free of any center and initialization, algorithm (9) can adaptively handle online data without re-initialization whenever network data/configuration changes. Moreover, it can work in a "plug-and-play" manner for dynamical networks with leaving-off or plugging-in of agents.

Next follows the convergence analysis of (9), where the proof techniques are inspired by the dynamical systems for variational inequality (referring to Xia & Wang (2000) and Gao (2003)) and distributed optimization (referring to Shi, Johanssan, & Hong (2013), Kia, Cortés, & Martinez (2015), Liu, Qiu, & Xie (2014), and Wang & Liu (2015)).

Theorem 3.4. *Under Assumptions 1-3 with strictly convex objective functions, the trajectories of the algorithm* (9) *are bounded and converge to its equilibrium point, namely, agent i asymptotically achieves its optimal allocation* x_i^* *of* (8) *with* (9).

Proof: We take $m = 1$ without loss of generality. Denote $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^n$. Define a new vector $S = (X, \Lambda, Z)$ and the vector function $F(S) : R^{3n} \to R^{3n}$ as

$$F(S) = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla f(X) - \Lambda \\ L\Lambda + LZ - (D - X) \\ -L\Lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

The whole system of (9) can be written as

$$\dot{S} = P_{\bar{\Omega}}(S - F(S)) - S.$$

Define $H(S) = P_{\bar{\Omega}}(S - F(S))$, and then give a Lyapunov function as

$$V_g = -\langle F(S), H(S) - S\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\|H(S) - S\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|S - S^*\|_2^2,$$

where $S^* = (X^*, \Lambda^*, Z^*)$, X^* is the optimal solution to (8), Λ^* is the optimal solution to (11), and Z^* is the dual optimal solution to (12).

Notice that X^* is a finite point from Assumption 2. Because the Slater's condition is satisfied with Assumption 2, the dual optimal solution λ^* for (10) exists and is finite by Proposition 5.3.1 of Bertsekas (2009). Notice that the function $f_i(x_i)$ is strictly convex, by Theorem 2.87 of Ruszczynski (2006) and the saddle point property of (10), $\nabla q_i(\lambda^*) = d_i - x_i^*$. Then, the KKT condition of (11) is $L\Lambda^* = \mathbf{0}$ and $D - X^* - L\Lambda^* - LZ^* = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $LZ^* = D - X^*$ implies the finiteness of the dual optimal solution Z^* for (11). Therefore, S^* is a finite point.

In fact, with the KKT conditions to (10) and (11), $F(S^*) = ((\nabla f(X^*) - \Lambda^*), \mathbf{0}_n, \mathbf{0}_n)$, and $-\nabla f(X^*) + \Lambda^* \in C_\Omega(X^*)$, we have

$$H(S^*) = P_{\bar{\Omega}}(S^* - F(S^*)) = S^*,\ -F(S^*) \in C_{\bar{\Omega}}(S^*). \qquad (16)$$

With the properties of projection operation (2) and (3),

$$\begin{aligned} &-\langle F(S), H(S) - S\rangle - \tfrac{1}{2}\langle H(S) - S, H(S) - S\rangle \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}[\|F(S)\|_2^2 - \|F(s) + H(S) - S\|_2^2] \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}[\|S - F(S) - S\|_2^2 - \|H(S) - (S - F(S))\|_2^2] \\ &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}\|S - H(S)\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $V_g \geq \frac{1}{2}\|S - H(S)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|S - S^*\| \geq 0$, and $V_g = 0$ if and only if $S = S^*$.

By Theorem 3.2 of Fukushima (1992), any asymmetric variational inequality can be converted to a differentiable optimization problem. Therefore,

$$\dot{V}_g = (F(S) - [J_F(S) - I](H(S) - S) + S - S^*)^T(H(S) - S),$$

where $J_F(S)$ is the Jacabian matrix of $F(S)$ defined as

$$J_F(S) = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^2 f(X) & -I & 0 \\ I & L & L \\ 0 & -L & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With Assumptions 3 and 1,

$$S^T J_F(\bar{S})S = X^T\nabla^2 f(\bar{X})X + \Lambda^T L\Lambda > 0 \quad \forall \bar{S} \in \bar{\Omega},\ \forall S \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{R}^{3n}.$$

With the projection property (2), take $x = S - F(S), y = S^*$, $\langle S - F(S) - H(S), H(S) - S^*\rangle \geq 0$. This implies that $\langle S - H(S) - F(S), H(S) - S + S - S^*\rangle \geq 0$. Hence, $-\|H(S) - S\|_2^2 + \langle S - H(S), S - S^*\rangle + \langle -F(S), H(S) - S\rangle + \langle -F(S), S - S^*\rangle \geq 0$. That is

$$\langle S - H(S), S - S^* + F(S)\rangle \geq \|H(S) - S\|_2^2 + \langle F(S), S - S^*\rangle$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_g &\leq -(H(S) - S)^T J_F(S)(H(S) - S) + \|H(S) - S\|_2^2 \\ &+ \langle S - S^* + F(S), H(S) - S\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle F(S), S - S^*\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle F(S), S - S^*\rangle + \langle F(S^*), S - S^*\rangle - \langle F(S^*), S - S^*\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle F(S) - F(S^*), S - S^*\rangle - \langle F(S^*), S - S^*\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, $\langle F(S) - F(S'), S - S'\rangle = \langle \nabla f(X) - \nabla f(X'), X - X'\rangle + \langle \Lambda - \Lambda', L(\Lambda - \Lambda')\rangle \geq 0,\ \forall S,\ S' \in \bar{\Omega}$, because the local objective functions are convex, and the Laplacian matrix is positive semi-definite with Assumptions 1 and 3. With (16), we have $\langle F(S^*), S - S^*\rangle \geq 0$. Then $\dot{V}_g \leq 0$, and any finite equilibrium point S^* is Lyapunov stable. Furthermore, there exists a forward compact invariance set given any finite initial point,

$$I_S = \{(X, \Lambda, Z) \big| \frac{1}{2}\|S - S^*\| \leq V_g(S(0))\}. \qquad (17)$$

Therefore, with the local Lipstchitz continuity of the objective functions' gradients in Assumption 1 and the nonexpansive property of projection operation (4), $P(S - F(S)) - S$ is Lipstchitz continuous over the compact set I_S in (17). There exists unique solution to (9) with time domain $[0, \infty)$. Meanwhile, the compactness and convexity of I_S implies the existence of equilibrium point to dynamics (9) (referring to page 228 of Aubin & Cellina (1984)). By Theorem 3.1 and without loss of generality, the equilibrium point is assumed to be S^*.

Meanwhile, there exists $c^* \in C_\Omega(X^*)$ such that $-\nabla f(X^*) + \Lambda^* = c^*$, $LZ^* = D - X^*$, and $\Lambda^* = \mathbf{1}_n\lambda^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_g &\leq -\langle F(S), S - S^*\rangle = -\langle X - X^*, \nabla f(X) - \Lambda\rangle \\ &\quad -\langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, L\Lambda + LZ - (D - X^*)\rangle - \langle Z - Z^*, -L\Lambda\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle X - X^*, \nabla f(X) - \Lambda - \nabla f(X^*) + \Lambda^* - c^*\rangle \\ &\quad -\langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, L(\Lambda - \Lambda^*)\rangle - \langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, L(Z - Z^*)\rangle \\ &\quad -\langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, LZ^* - (D - X)\rangle - \langle Z - Z^*, -L(\Lambda - \Lambda^*)\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle X - X^*, \nabla f(X) - \nabla f(X^*)\rangle + \langle X - X^*, c^*\rangle \\ &\quad -\langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, L(\Lambda - \Lambda^*)\rangle \\ &\leq -\langle X - X^*, \nabla f(X) - \nabla f(X^*)\rangle - \langle \Lambda - \Lambda^*, L(\Lambda - \Lambda^*)\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Table 1: Parameters setting of Example 3.6

	$0 \sim 600s$	$600s \sim 1200s$	$1200s \sim$
a_1, d_1	(8,2), (8,2)	(0.1,0.3), (8,2)	(0.1,0.3), (12,-3)
a_2, d_2	(4,7), (3,4)	(-17,15), (3,4)	(-17,15), (0,7)
a_3, d_3	(0.13,8), (3,8)	(0.13,8), (-5,12)	(3,0.7), (-5,12)
a_4, d_4	(4,20), (10,2)	(4,20), (1,15)	(5,17), (1,15)

where the last step follows from $\langle X - X^*, c^* \rangle \leq 0$. Denote the set of points satisfying $\dot{V}_g = 0$ as $E_g = \{(X, \Lambda, Z) \big| \dot{V}_g = 0\}$. Because the Hessian matrix of $\nabla^2 f(X)$ is positive definite, $\nabla f(X) = \nabla f(X^*) + \int_0^1 \nabla^2 f(\tau X + (1-\tau)X^*)^T (X - X^*) d\tau$, and the null space for L imply that

$$E_g = \{(X, \Lambda, Z) \big| X = X^*, \Lambda \in span\{\alpha \mathbf{1}_n\}\}.$$

Then we claim that the maximal invariance set within the set E_g is exactly the equilibrium point of (9). In fact, $\Lambda \in span\{\alpha \mathbf{1}_n\}$ implies $Z = Z^*$. Hence, $\dot{\Lambda} = LZ^* - (D - X^*)$. However, $LZ^* - (D - X^*)$ must be zero; otherwise Λ will go to infinity, which contradicts that E_g is a compact set within I_S. Therefore, $\dot{\Lambda} = 0$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda^*$.

Invoking the LaSalle invariance principle and Lyapunov stability of the equilibrium point, the system (9) converges to its equilibrium point, which implies the conclusion. □

Remark 3.5. *Notice that initialization-free algorithm has also been proposed and investigated in Cherukuri & Cortés (2014). Here, algorithm* (9) *provides a different type of algorithm to address the DRAO problem without initialization. Besides that, algorithm* (9) *can address the general multi-dimensional AFCs explicitly with projection operation, while Cherukuri & Cortés (2014) only addressed one-dimensional box constraint approximately with penalty method. Moreover, our proof techniques introduce the viewpoint of variation inequality besides the Lyapunov methods and invariance principle.*

The following example illustrates how (9) "adaptively" achieves the optimal resource allocation without re-initialization for a dynamical network. Notice that the following example cannot be directly addressed by the algorithm in Cherukuri & Cortés (2014).

Example 3.6. *Four agents cooperatively optimize problem* (8). *The allocation variable and resource data for agent i are $x_i = (x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}) \in \mathbf{R}^2$, $d_i = (d_{i,1}, d_{i,2}) \in \mathbf{R}^2$, respectively. The objective functions $f_i(x_i)$ are parameterized with $a_i = (a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}) \in \mathbf{R}^2$ as follows*

$$f_i(x_i) = (x_{i,1} + a_{i,1} x_{i,2})^2 + x_{i,1} + a_{i,2} x_{i,2} + 0.001(x_{i,1}^2 + x_{i,2}^2).$$

The local AFCs are shown in Figure 1. The agents share information with a ring graph $\mathcal{G}$:

$$1 \leftrightarrow 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \leftrightarrow 4 \leftrightarrow 1.$$



Figure 1: The trajectories of the allocations: The agents have different AFC sets whose boundaries are highlighted. The starting points of x_i at time 0s,600s and 1200s are marked with circles, and the points at time 2200s are also labeled. It indicates that all the agents' trajectories always flow within their AFC sets.



Figure 2: Algorithm performance criterions: (i) The Lagrangian multiplies λ_i's always reach consensus after the transient process; (ii) Even though the network resources constraint is violated after some local data changes, it can be satisfied asymptotically; (iii) $\|\dot{X}\|_2^2 + \|\dot{\Lambda}\|_2^2 + \|\dot{Z}\|_2^2$ always converges to zero, implying the optimality of the resource allocations.

The initial allocation $x_i(0)$ of agent i in algorithm (9) is randomly chosen within its AFC set, and Λ, Z are set with zero initial values. The data a_i and d_i switches as Table 3, while the allocation variables remain unchanged when the data switches. The simulation results are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

4. DRAO with Strongly Convex Objective Functions

In this section, the differentiated projection operator (6) is applied to derive an exponential convergence algorithm for (8) when the objective functions are strongly convex.

The operator in (6) was firstly introduced for the studies of constrained stochastic approximation in Dupuis & Kushner (1987), and later on had been utilized to construct dynamical systems for solving variational inequality in Nagurney & Zhang (1995) and Brogliato, Daniilidis, Lemarchal, & Acary

(2006). Here the operator (6) is applied to derive the distributed resource allocation algorithm for agent i as follows

$$\begin{array}{l}\textbf{Differentiated projected algorithm for agent i}:\\ \dot{x}_i = \Pi_{\Omega_i}(x_i, -\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i)\\ \dot{\lambda}_i = -\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(z_i - z_j) + (d_i - x_i)\\ \dot{z}_i = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)\end{array} \tag{18}$$

Remark 4.1. *The algorithm* (18) *is a direct extension of* (9) *by differentiating the projection operator. In fact, it requires each agent to project* $-\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i$ *onto the tangent cone* $T_{\Omega_i}(x_i)$*. Thereby,* (18) *has the additional burden for the tangent cone computation compared with* (9)*. However, for some specific convex sets such as polyhedron, Euclidean ball, and boxes, it is not hard to get the close form of the tangent cone at any given point.*

Similar to the algorithm (9), the algorithm (18) is still one distributed algorithm, and it does not need any initialization coordination procedure, too. Therefore, it can efficiently process online data for dynamical networks.

The following result shows the correctness of algorithm (18).

Theorem 4.2. *Under Assumptions 1-3 with strongly convex objective functions, if the initial point* $x_i(0) \in \Omega_i,\ \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$*, then* $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i,\ \forall t \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}$*, and there is the equilibrium point of the distributed algorithm* (18) *with* $X^* = (x_1^*, ..., x_n^*)$ *as the optimal solution to* (8)*.*

Proof: Obviously, $\dot{x}_i \in T_{\Omega_i}(x_i),\ \forall x_i \in \Omega_i$ with Lemma 2.1. Given the initial point $x_i(0) \in \Omega_i$, by Theorem 3.2 of Cojocaru & Jonker (2004) and the viability theorem of Aubin & Cellina (1984), $x_i(t) \in \Omega_i, \forall t \geq 0$.

By Lemma 2.1, we have $\Pi_{\Omega_i}(x_i, -\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i) = 0$ if at least one of the following cases is satisfied: (i):$x_i \in int(\Omega_i)$, and $-\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i = 0$; (ii): $x_i \in \partial\Omega_i$, and $-\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i = 0$; (iii): $x_i \in \partial\Omega_i$, and $-\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i)$. Hence, $\Pi_{\Omega_i}(x_i, -\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i) = 0$ implies $-\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i)$. Following similar analysis of Theorem 3.1, at the equilibrium point we have

$$\begin{array}{l}\Lambda^* = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \lambda^*, \lambda^* \in \mathbf{R}^m, \quad x_i^* \in \Omega_i\\ (L \otimes I_m)Z^* = D - X^*, \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} x_i^* = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} d_i,\\ -\nabla f_i(x_i^*) + \lambda^* \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i^*).\end{array} \tag{19}$$

Therefore, the optimality condition (14) of (8) is satisfied by the equilibrium point of (18). □

Next result shows that algorithm (18) has exponential convergence rate when the local objective functions are strongly convex.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold and the local objective functions* $f_i(x_i)$ *are* μ_i*-strongly convex functions with* k_i*-Lipschitz continuous gradients. Then the trajectories of algorithm (18) exponentially converge to its equilibrium point, with the convergence rate no less than*

$$\min\{\quad \frac{2s_2}{8+6s_2+s_n^2},\ \frac{4s_2^2\bar{\mu}}{(3+2s_n^2+M^2+6\bar{\mu})s_2^2+9\bar{\mu}s_2+3\sqrt{6\bar{\mu}s_2+1}+3}\}$$

where $\bar{\mu} = \min\{\mu_1, ..., \mu_n\}$*,* $M = \max\{k_i, i \in \mathcal{N}\}$*, and* s_2, s_n *are the smallest and largest non-zero eigenvalues of Laplacian L, respectively.*

Proof: The existence of an absolutely continuous solution to algorithm (18) can be found in Theorem 2.5 of Nagurney & Zhang (1995) and Theorem 1 of Brogliato, Daniilidis, Lemarchal, & Acary (2006).

We still take $m = 1$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 2.1,

$$\Pi_{\Omega_i}(x_i, -\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i) = -\nabla f_i(x_i) + \lambda_i - \beta(x_i)n_i(x_i), \tag{20}$$

where $n_i(x_i) \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i),\ \beta(x_i) \geq 0$. Notice that at the equilibrium point, there exist $\beta(x_i^*) \geq 0, n_i(x_i^*) \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i^*)$, such that $\nabla f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda^* = -\beta(x_i^*)n_i(x_i^*)$.

Define the following variables

$$\begin{array}{lll}Y = X - X^*, & \theta = [r\ R]^T Y, & Y = [r\ R]\theta,\\ V = \Lambda - \Lambda^*, & \eta = [r\ R]^T V, & V = [r\ R]\eta,\\ W = Z - Z^*, & \delta = [r\ R]^T W, & W = [r\ R]\delta,\end{array} \tag{21}$$

with $r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{1}_n$ and $r^T R = \mathbf{0}_n^T$ such that $R^T R = I_{n-1}$ and $RR^T = I_n - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^T$. We partition the variables θ, η, δ as (θ_1, θ_2), (η_1, η_2), (δ_1, δ_2) with $\theta_1, \eta_1, \delta_1 \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\theta_2, \eta_2, \delta_2 \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$.

Then the dynamics of the variables (θ, η, δ) can be derived with (18), (19), (20) and (21) as follows

$$\begin{array}{ll}\dot{\theta}_1 = -r^T h + \eta_1; & \dot{\theta}_2 = -R^T h + \eta_2;\\ \dot{\eta}_1 = -\theta_1; & \dot{\eta}_2 = -\theta_2 - R^T LR\eta_2 - R^T LR\delta_2;\\ \dot{\delta}_1 = 0; & \dot{\delta}_2 = R^T LR\eta_2,\end{array} \tag{22}$$

where $h = \nabla f(Y + X^*) - \nabla f(X^*) + N_\Omega(X) - N_\Omega(X^*)$, $N_\Omega(X) = (\beta(x_1)n_1(x_1), ..., \beta(x_n)n_n(x_n))$, and $N_\Omega(X^*) = (\beta(x_1^*)n_1(x_1^*), ..., \beta(x_n^*)n_n(x_n^*))$.

Construct the following function

$$\begin{array}{rcl}V_1^s &=& \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\theta^T\theta + \eta^T\eta) + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha+\gamma)\delta_2^T\delta_2\\ &+& \frac{1}{2}\gamma(\eta_2 + \delta_2)^T(\eta_2 + \delta_2)\end{array} \tag{23}$$

where α, γ are positive constants to be determined later. Obviously, $\frac{1}{2}\alpha\|p\|_2^2 \leq V_1^s \leq (\frac{1}{2}(\alpha+\gamma) + \gamma)\|p\|_2^2$ where $p = (\theta, \eta, \delta_2)$. The derivative of V_1^s along (18) is

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\dot{V}_1^s &=& \alpha(-Y^T h - \eta_2 R^T LR\eta_2 - \eta_2 R^T LR\delta_2)\\ &+& \gamma(-\eta_2^T\theta_2 - \eta_2 R^T LR\delta_2 - \delta_2\theta_2 - \delta_2^T R^T LR\delta_2)\\ &+& (\alpha+\gamma)\delta_2^T R^T LR\eta_2.\end{array}$$

Because $n_i(x_i^*) \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i^*)$ and $\beta(x_i^*) \geq 0$, $\beta(x_i^*)\langle x_i - x_i^*, n_i(x_i^*)\rangle \leq 0$. Meanwhile, $n_i(x_i) \in C_{\Omega_i}(x_i)$ and $\beta(x_i) \geq 0$ implies that $\beta(x_i)\langle x_i - x_i^*, n_i(x_i)\rangle \geq 0$. Because the local objective functions are strongly convex, $Y^T h = (X - X^*)^T(\nabla f(X) - \nabla f(X^*) + N_\Omega(X) - N_\Omega(X^*)) = (X - X^*)^T(\nabla f(X) - \nabla f(X^*)) +$

$\sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i - x_i^*, +\beta(x_i)n_i(x_i)\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i - x_i^*, -\beta(x_i^*)n_i(x_i^*)\rangle \geq \bar{\mu}\theta^T\theta$ where $\bar{\mu} = \min\{\mu_1, ..., \mu_n\}$.

Denote $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq ... \leq s_n$ as the ordered eigenvalues of Laplacian matrix L. Obviously, $s_1 = 0$ and $s_2 > 0$ when the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected. By (7),

$$\dot{V}_1^s \leq -\alpha\bar{\mu}\theta^T\theta - \alpha s_2\eta_2^T\eta_2 - \gamma s_2\delta_2^T\delta_2 - \gamma\eta_2^T\theta_2 - \gamma\delta_2\theta_2.$$

According to $-\gamma\eta_2^T\theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2\theta_2^T\theta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\eta_2^T\eta_2$, and $-\gamma\delta_2^T\theta_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2\theta_2^T\theta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_2^T\delta_2$, we have

$$\dot{V}_1^s \leq -(\alpha\bar{\mu} - \gamma^2)\theta^T\theta - (\alpha s_2 - \frac{1}{2})\eta_2^T\eta_2 - (\gamma s_2 - \frac{1}{2})\delta_2^T\delta_2.$$

Take $V_2^s = \varepsilon(\theta - \eta)^T(\theta - \eta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_2^s &= -\varepsilon Y^T h + \varepsilon\theta^T\theta + \varepsilon\theta_2 R^T LR\eta_2 + \varepsilon\theta_2 R^T LR\delta_2 \\
&\quad +\varepsilon\eta^T[r, R]^T h - \varepsilon\eta^T\eta - \varepsilon\eta_2 R^T LR\eta_2 - \varepsilon\eta_2 R^T LR\delta_2 \\
&\leq -(\varepsilon\bar{\mu} - \varepsilon)\theta^T\theta + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon s_n^2\theta^T\theta + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\eta_2^T\eta_2^T + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon s_n^2\theta^T\theta \\
&\quad +\tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\delta_2\delta_2^T + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\eta^T\eta + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon M^2\theta^T\theta - \varepsilon\eta^T\eta - \varepsilon s_2\eta_2^T\eta_2 \\
&\quad +\tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon s_n^2\eta_2^T\eta_2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\delta_2^T\delta_2 \\
&\leq -\varepsilon(\bar{\mu} - 1 - s_n^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}M^2)\theta^T\theta - \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\eta^T\eta \\
&\quad +\varepsilon\delta_2^T\delta_2 - \varepsilon(s_2 - \tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{2}s_n^2)\eta_2^T\eta_2
\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max\{k_i, i \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is the maximal Lipstchitz constants. In the first step of (24), we have utilized the inequality $x^T y \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_2^2 + \|y\|_2^2$ and the relationship (7).

Take $V^s = V_1^s + V_2^s$, and then

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}^s &= -(\alpha\bar{\mu} - \gamma^2 + \varepsilon(\bar{\mu} - 1 - s_n^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}M^2))\theta^T\theta \\
&\quad - \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon\eta^T\eta - (\gamma s_2 - \tfrac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)\delta_2^T\delta_2 \\
&\quad - (\alpha s_2 - \tfrac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(s_2 - \tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{2}s_n^2))\eta_2^T\eta_2
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Choose $\gamma \geq \frac{3\varepsilon+1}{2s_2}$ such that $\gamma s_2 - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Select α such that

$$\alpha\bar{\mu} - \gamma^2 + \varepsilon(\bar{\mu} - 1 - s_n^2 - \frac{1}{2}M^2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \tag{25}$$

and

$$(\alpha s_2 - \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(s_2 - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}s_n^2)) \geq 0. \tag{26}$$

As a result,

$$\dot{V}^s \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\|p\|_2^2.$$

Then, with $\frac{1}{2}\alpha\|p\|_2^2 \leq V^s \leq (\frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \gamma) + \gamma + 2\varepsilon)\|p\|_2^2$, we have

$$\|p\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha + 3\gamma + 4\varepsilon}{\alpha}}\|p(0)\|e^{-\frac{2\varepsilon}{\alpha+3\gamma+4\varepsilon}t}, \tag{27}$$

which leads to the exponential stability of the equilibrium point of algorithm (18).

The term $\frac{2\varepsilon}{(\alpha+3\gamma+4\varepsilon)}$ can be maximized with the following optimization problem

$$\max_{\alpha,\gamma,\varepsilon\geq 0} \frac{2\varepsilon}{(\alpha + 3\gamma + 4\varepsilon)} \qquad s.\,t.\ \gamma \geq \frac{3\varepsilon + 1}{2s_2},\ (25),\ (26).$$

To get a simple estimation, we take $\gamma = \frac{3\varepsilon+1}{2s_2}$. Denote $\varrho_1 = (s_n^2 + 1 - 2s_2)$ and $\varrho_2 = s_2^2(6 + 4s_n^2 + 2M^2 - 4\bar{\mu})$. With taking $\alpha = \max\{\frac{1+\varepsilon\varrho_1}{2s_2}, \frac{9\varepsilon^2+\varepsilon(6+\varrho_2)+1}{4s_2^2\bar{\mu}}\}$, we have $\frac{2\varepsilon}{(\alpha+3\gamma+4\varepsilon)} \geq \min\{\frac{2s_2}{8+6s_2+s_n^2}, \frac{4s_2^2\bar{\mu}}{(3+2s_n^2+M^2+6\bar{\mu})s_2^2+9\bar{\mu}s_2+3\sqrt{6\bar{\mu}s_2+1}+3}\}$. Thus, the conclusion follows. □

Clearly, the convergence speed of (18) is influenced by s_2, i.e., the algebraic connectivity of the information sharing graph $\mathcal{G}$, which increases if s_2 increases. Also, the convergence speed is influenced by strongly convex parameters μ_i and Lipschitz constants k_i.

5. Distributed Economic Dispatch in Power Grids

In this section, the algorithm in Section 4 is applied to the DEDP in power grids. Example 5.2 is given to show that the distributed algorithm can efficiently address online data changes, including **load demands and generation costs/capacities.** Example 5.3 with large scale network is given to show the **scalability** of the proposed algorithm.

The DEDP has been investigated in power grids recently (see Zhao, Topcu, Li, & Low (2014), Zhang, Liu, Wang, Liu, & Ferrese (2015) and Cherukuri, & Cortés (2015)), aiming to find the optimal secure generation allocations for power balancing in a distributed manner. Suppose that there exist control areas $\mathcal{N} = \{1, ..., n\}$ with area i having local generators to supply power P_i^g and local load demand P_i^d to be met. The local generation must be kept within the capacity or security bounds $\underline{P}_i \leq P_i^g \leq \bar{P}_i$. $f_i(P_i^g)$ represents the local generation cost in control area i with respect to its local generation P_i^g, and it satisfies Assumption 1. Then the DEDP formulation can be derived in the form of (8)

Distributed Economic Dispatch Problem :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{P_i^g, i\in\mathcal{N}} \quad f(P^g) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} f_i(P_i^g) \\
&subject\ to \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} P_i^g = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} P_i^d \\
&\qquad \underline{P}_i \leq P_i^g \leq \bar{P}_i, \quad \mathcal{N} = \{1, ..., n\}
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Here a multi-agent network is introduced to solve the DEDP (28). Agent i is responsible to decide the generation P_i^g in control area i to minimize the global cost as the sum of all individuals' costs, while satisfying the AFCs. In fact, each agent can react to the changing local environment in real time, and adapt its own behavior or preference by adjusting its local data, including $P_i^d, \underline{P}_i, \bar{P}_i, f_i(P_i^g)$. The agents can also share information with their neighbors to facilitate the cooperation.

Then applying (18) to (28), the distributed algorithm for agent i is

Distributed algorithm for agent i :

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{P}_i^g &= [-\nabla f_i(P_i^g) + \lambda_i]_{P_i^g - \underline{P}_i}^{\bar{P}_i - P_i^g} \\
\dot{\lambda}_i &= -\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(z_i - z_j) + (P_i^d - P_i^g) \\
\dot{z}_i &= \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}_i}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $[v]_{x-c_1}^{c_2-x} = 0$ if $x - c_1 = 0$ and $v \leq 0$ or $c_2 - x = 0$ and $v \geq 0$, otherwise $[v]_{x-c_1}^{c_2-x} = v$.



Figure 3: The generation trajectories: The optimal secure generation allocation can always be found with different load demands, generation capacities/costs, and network configurations. The generation of each agent always satisfies its capacity bounds, even during the transient process.


The λ of five agents
λ_1 of agent 1 λ_2 of agent 2 λ_3 of agent 3 λ_4 of agent 4 λ_5 of agent 5
Time
Power balance gap
$\sum_{i=1}^5 P_i^d - \sum_{i=1}^5 P_i^g$
Time
The optimal criterion
$||\dot{P}^g||_2^2 + ||\dot{\lambda}||_2^2 + ||\dot{Z}||_2^2$
Time

Figure 4: Algorithm performance criterions: (i):λ's always reach consensus. (ii): The power balance constraint (i.e., resource constraint) is violated if any network configuration changes. But the power balance gap $\sum_{i=1}^5 P_i^d - \sum_{i=1}^5 P_i^g$ exponentially decreases to zero, even without re-initialization. (iii): The optimality criterion $\|\dot{P}^g\|_2^2 + \|\dot{\lambda}\|_2^2 + \|\dot{Z}\|_2^2 = 0$ can always be achieved exponentially, implying the economic efficiency of the generation dispatch.

Table 2: Initial parameters setting for Example 5.2

	Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Agent 5
(a_i, b_i)	$(\frac{5}{4}, 2)$	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	$(\frac{1}{8}, 1)$	$(2, 2)$	$(\frac{1}{8}, 2)$
$(\underline{P}_i, \bar{P}_i)$	$(\frac{5}{2}, \frac{9}{2})$	$(1, 9)$	$(\frac{3}{2}, 3)$	$(\frac{1}{2}, 11)$	$(2, 4)$
P_i^d	2	8	2	5	7

Compared with the DEDP algorithms in Zhao, Topcu, Li, & Low (2014), Zhang, Liu, Wang, Liu, & Ferrese (2015), and Cherukuri, & Cortés (2015), the algorithm (29) ensures generation capacity bounds explicitly, and converges without the initialization procedure, which is crucially important for the "plug-and-play" operation in the future smart grid.

Remark 5.1. *The optimization problem* (8) *can also be applied to model the multi-period demand response in power system. The objective functions describe the dis-utility of cutting loads in each area. The resource constraint specifies the amount of loads to be shed in the multi-periods. Particularly, the local load shedding constraints can consider the total power demands in the multi-periods and other specifications of that area. Then, the previous algorithms* (9) *and* (18) *can be applied to solve this problem in a distributed manner. This issue is interesting but beyond the scope of this paper, and will not be discussed here.*

The following two examples are presented to further show the online adaptation property and scalability for our algorithm.

Example 5.2 (Optimality and adaptability). *Consider five agents to decide the generations P_i^g of their control areas. The local quadratic cost functions $f_i(P_i^g) = a_i P_i^{g2} + b_i P_i^g$ are parameterized with (a_i, b_i)s. The initial data setting for (a_i, b_i), P_i^d, $\underline{P}_i$, $\bar{P}_i$ is given in Table 2.*

The experiment data switches with the following rules: at $t = 50s$, the load demands for agents $1, 2$ switch to $P_1^d = 7, P_2^d = 6$; at $t = 100s$, the capacities bounds for agents $3, 5$ switch to $(\underline{P}_3, \bar{P}_3) = (\frac{5}{2}, 4)$, $(\underline{P}_5, \bar{P}_5) = (\frac{1}{2}, 2)$; at $t = 150s$, the cost function parameters for agents $1, 4$ switch to $(a_1, b_1) = (3, 5)$, $(a_4, b_4) = (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$. After $t = 200s$, the agent 5 disconnects from the network.

The agents share information with graph $\mathcal{G}_1$ before $t = 200s$: $1 \leftrightarrow 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \leftrightarrow 4 \leftrightarrow 5 \leftrightarrow 1$, and with graph $\mathcal{G}_2$ after $t = 200s$: $1 \leftrightarrow 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \leftrightarrow 4$. The simulations are performed with the differentiated projected algorithm (29). *The initial generation P_i^g in algorithm (29) is set within its local capacity bounds, while other variables are set with zero initial values.*

The simulation results are shown in Figures 3 and 4. The simulation results indicate that algorithm (29) *can adaptively find the optimal solutions of* (28) *in a fully distributed way, even without initialization coordination procedure when network data or configuration changes.*

Example 5.3 (Scalability). *This example considers a network of* **1000** *control areas to achieve economic dispatch during a normal day. Control area i has cost function $f_i(P_i^g) = a_i P_i^{g2} + b_i P_i^g$, generation capacity upper bound $\bar{P}_i$ and lower bound $\underline{P}_i$. The control areas are divided equally into two groups. The first group, named as fuel group, is mainly supported with traditional thermal generator, and has relatively higher generation cost and larger capacity range with the data $a_i, b_i, \underline{P}_i, \bar{P}_i$ randomly drawn from the intervals: $[3, 7](M\$/MW^2)$, $[5, 9](M\$/MW)$, $[2, 6](MW)$, $[15, 23](MW)$, respectively. The second group, named as renewable group, is mainly supported with renewable energies, and has lower generation cost and smaller capacity range with the data $a_i, b_i, \underline{P}_i, \bar{P}_i$ randomly drawn from the intervals: $[\frac{1}{2}, 2](M\$/MW^2)$, $[\frac{1}{2}, 4](M\$/MW)$, $[0, 1](MW)$, $[\frac{3}{2}, 7](MW)$, respectively.*

The daily 96-point load data (15min for each period) of each control area is generated from a typical load curve for a distribution system added with certain random perturbations. The total load curve of the network is given in Fig 5.

In each period, a connected graph is re-generated with random graph model $\mathcal{G}(1000, \mathbb{P})$ as the information sharing graph



Figure 5: The total load curve



Figure 6: The criterions values at time $t = 80s$ in histograms: (i): The consensus error $||L\Lambda||_2$ at $t = 80s$ always decreases to a rather lower level due to the second-order proportional-integral consensus dynamics. (ii): The power balance is almost achieved at $t = 80s$ without the initialization coordination. (iii): The optimality criterion can always be achieved at $t = 80s$.

of that period. In $\mathcal{G}(1000, \mathbb{P})$, every possible edge occurs independently with the probability of $\mathbb{P}$. Here, the probability $\mathbb{P}$ in each period is also randomly drawn from the interval $[0.0015, 0.005]$. In each period, 10% agents of the renewable group are randomly chosen to vary the generation costs and capacities like Example 5.2 with the variations less that 20% of its nominal values.

For each period, the computation time is set as 80s. Figure 6 shows consensus error $||L\Lambda||_2$, optimality criterion $||\dot{P}^g||_2 + ||\dot{\Lambda}||_2 + ||\dot{Z}||_2$ and power balance gap $\sum P_i^g - \sum P_i^d$ at time 80s. It indicates that the agents can always find the economic power dispatch with varying loads and generation costs/capacities, evidently demonstrating the scalability of the proposed methodology.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, a class of projected continuous-time distributed algorithms are proposed to solve resource allocation optimization problems with the consideration of AFCs. The proposed algorithms are scalable and free of initialization coordination procedure, and therefore, are adaptable to working condition variations, enabling a "plug-and-play" operation for dynamic networks. Furthermore, it is applied to the DEDP in power grids. We would like to note that many challenging DRAO problems still remain to be investigated, including the study of generalized algorithms in a differential inclusion form (Aubin & Cellina (1984) and Cherukuri & Cortés (2014)) to deal with the non-smooth objective functions, and the development of stochastic algorithms to address the data observation uncertainty (Dupuis & Kushner (1987)), which are under our ongoing investigation.

7. Reference

References

Arrow, K., Huwicz, L., & Uzawa, H. (1958). *Studies in Linear and Non-linear Programming*, Stanford University Press.

Arrow, K. J., & Hurwicz, L. (1960). Decentralization and Computation in Resource Allocation. *Economics and Econometrics*, 34-104, University of North Carolina Press.

Aubin, J.P., & Cellina, A. (1984). *Differential Inclusions*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Beck, A., Nedic, A., Ozdaglar, A., & Teboulle, M. (2014). Optimal Distributed Gradient Methods for Network Resource Allocation Problems. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(1),64-74.

Bertsekas, D. P. (2009). *Convex Optimization Theory*, MIT: Athena Scientific.

Bhaya, A., & Kaszkurewicz, E. (2006). *Control perspectives on numerical algorithms and matrix problems*, 10, SIAM.

Brogliato, B., Daniilidis, A., Lemarchal, C., & Acary, V. (2006). On the equivalence between complementarity systems, projected systems and differential inclusions. *Systems & Control Letters*, 55(1), 45-51.

Cherukuri, A., & Cortés, J. (2015) Distributed generator coordination for initialization and anytime optimization in economic dispatch. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, doi: 10.1109/TCNS.2015.2399191

Cherukuri, A., & Cortés, J. (2014) Initialization-free distributed coordination for economic dispatch under varying loads and generator commitment, Available in arXiv at:*http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4382*

Cojocaru, M. G., & Jonker, L. (2004). Existence of solutions to projected differential equations in Hilbert spaces. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 132(1), 183-193.

D'Amico, A., Sanguinetti, L. & Palomar, D.P., (2014). Convex separable problems with linear constraints in signal processing and communictions, *IEEE transaction on signal processing*, 62(22), 6045-6058.

Droge, G., Kawashima, H., & Egerstedt, M. B. (2014). Continuous-time proportional-integral distributed optimisation for networked systems. *Journal of Control and Decision*, 1(3), 191-213.

Dupuis, P., & Kushner, H. J. (1987). Asymptotic behavior of constrained stochastic approximations via the theory of large deviations. *Probability theory and related fields*, 75(2), 223-244.

Feijer, D., & Paganini, F. (2010). Stability of primalCdual gradient dynamics and applications to network optimization. *Automatica*, 46(12), 1974-1981.

Ferragut, A., & Paganini, F. (2014). Network resource allocation for users with multiple connections: fairness and stability. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 22(2), 349-362.

Fukushima, M. (1992). Equivalent differentiable optimization problems and descent methods for asymmetric variational inequality problems, *Mathematical programming*, 53(1-3), 99-110.

Gao, X. B. (2003). Exponential stabiliby of globally projected dynamic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 14(2), 426-431.

Ghadimi, E., Shames, I., & Johansson, M. (2013). Multi-step gradient methods for networked optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 61(21), 5417-5429.

Gharesifard, B., & Cortés, J. (2014). Distributed continuous-time convex optimization on weight-balanced digraphs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(3), 781-786.

Heal, G. M. (1969). Planning without Prices. *Review of Economic Studies*, 36(107), 347-362.

Ho, Y. C., Servi, L., & Suri, R. (1980). A class of center-free resource allocation algorithms. *Large Scale Systems*, 1: 51-62.

Ibaraki, T., & Katoh, N. (1988). *Resource Allocation Problems: Algorithmic Approaches*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Johari, R., & Tsitsiklis, J. N. (2004). Efficiency Loss in a Network Resource Allocation Game, *Mathematics of operations research*, 29(3), 407C435.

Kia, S., Cortés, J., & Martinez, S. (2015). Distributed convex optimization via continuous-time coordination algorithms with discrete-time communication. *Automatica*, 55(5), 254-264.

Lakshmanan, H., & Farias, D. P. (2008). Decentralized Resource Allocation in Dynamic Networks of Agents. *SIAM Journal of Optimization*, 19(2), 911-940.

Liao, L. Z., Qi, H., & Qi, L. (2004). Neurodynamical optimization. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 28(2), 175-195.

Liu, S., Qiu, Z., & Xie, L. (2014). Continuous-time Distributed Convex Optimization with Set Constraints. *Proceedings of the 19th IFAC World Congress*, Cape Town, South Africa (pp. 9762-9767)

Lou, Y., Shi, G., Johansson, K.H., & Hong, Y. (2014). Approximate Projected Consensus for Convex Intersection Computation: Convergence Analysis and Critical Error Angle. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(7), 1722-1736.

Low, S. H., Paganini, F., & Doyle, J. C. (2002). Internet congestion control. *IEEE Control Systems magazine* , 22(1), 28-43.

Mesbahi, M., & Egerstedt, M. (2010). *Graph Theoretic Methods for Multiagent Networks*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nagurney, A., & Zhang, D. (1995). *Projected dynamical systems and variational inequalities with applications* (Vol. 2). Springer Science & Business Media.

Necoara, I., Nesterov, Y., & Glineur, F. (2011). *A random coordinate descent method on large optimization problems with linear constraints.* Technical Report, University Politehnica Bucharest, Romanian.

Nedic, A., Ozdaglar, A., & Parrilo, A. P.(2010). Constrained Consensus and Optimization in Multi-Agent Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(4), 922-938.

Ruszczynski, A. P. (2006). *Nonlinear Optimization*, Princeton: Princeton university press.

Sayed, A. H. (2014). Adaptation, learning, and optimization over networks. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 7(4-5), 311-801.

Shi, G., Johansson, K. H., & Hong, Y. (2013). Reaching an optimal consensus: dynamical systems that compute intersections of convex sets. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(3), 610-622.

Venets, V. I. (1985). Continuous algorithms for solution of convex optimization problems and finding saddle points of contex-coneave functions with the use of projection operations. *Optimization*, 16(4), 519-533.

Wang, J., & Elia, N.(2011). A control perspective for centralized and distributed convex optimization. *Proceding of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Orlando, USA (pp. 3800-3805)

Wang, J., & Liu, Q. (2015). A Second-order Multi-agent Network for Bound-Constrained Distributed Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2015.241692.

Xia, Y. S., & Wang, J. (2000). On the stability of globally projected dynamical systems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 106(1), 129-150.

Xiao, L., & Boyd, S. (2006). Optimal Scaling of a gradient method for distributed resource allocation. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 129(3), 469-488.

Yi, P. & Hong, Y. (2014). Quantized Subgradient Algorithm and Data-Rate Analysis for Distributed Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(4), 380-392.

Yi, P., Hong, Y., & Liu, F. (2015). Distributed Gradient Algorithm for Constrained Optimization with Application to Load Sharing in Power Systems. *Systems & Control Letter*, 83, 45-52.

Zhang, W., Liu, W., Wang, X., Liu, L., & Ferrese, F. (2015). Online Optimal Generation Control Based on Constrained Distributed Gradient Algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 30(1), 35-45.

Zhao, C., Topcu, U., Li, N., & Low, S. H. (2014). Design and stability of load-side primary frequency control in power systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(5), 1177-1189.